

## REMARKS

### Summary

Claims 1-12 were pending. Claim 1 has been rewritten, Claims 11-12 cancelled and Claims 13-27 added. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

### Objection to Claims

Claims 11-12 were objected to because of informalities. Applicants have cancelled Claims 11-12 and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection in the next Office Action.

### Rejection of Claims

Claims 1 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gotoh (U.S. Patent 6,847,424) or Umemoto (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0043315) and Claims 2-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotoh. Applicants have rewritten Claim 1 and submit that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection. Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 8.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, that the anti-reflective structure comprises micro holes. Each micro hole has an opening at a first surface and a bottom facing a second surface opposite to the first surface. The first surface adjacent to each micro hole is substantially planar. The micro holes are shaped to prevent light incident on the anti-reflective structure from being reflected by the anti-reflective structure.

Neither Gotoh nor Umemoto anticipates such an arrangement. In Gotoh, as clearly shown in Figs. 18 and 19A, the surface adjacent to the majority of the conical sections 308c is curved. As described in Gotoh, the curvature between the conical sections is a result of the method of forming the layer 308.

Umemoto is entirely directed towards a reflective structure, not an anti-reflective structure. Whether or not the holes themselves reflect, as the Examiner indicates, is immaterial as Claim 1 recites an anti-reflective structure (that contains holes), not anti-reflective holes. Thus, at the least

Umemoto does not anticipate micro holes shaped to prevent light incident on the anti-reflective structure from being reflected by the anti-reflective structure.

Regarding Claim 8, Claim 8 recites a light guide that comprises, inter alia, an anti-reflective structure having micro holes. Each micro hole has an opening at a first surface and a bottom facing a second surface opposite to the first surface. A reflective structure having many micro grooves is formed in the second surface.

As in Claim 1, Umemoto is entirely directed towards a reflective structure. Umemoto does not anticipate an anti-reflective structure.

Gotoh as illustrated in Figs. 18-21, teaches an arrangement in which the light guide 341 only reflects light towards the LCD panel thereabove. The layer 308 containing the conical sections 308 is contained within the LCD panel, not the light guide. Accordingly, Gotoh does not anticipate a light guide containing both an anti-reflective structure and a reflective structure.

For at least these reasons, none of the cited references anticipate the arrangements of Claims 1, 8, 9, or 10. Accordingly, Claims 1, 8, 9, or 10 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-7 are dependent on Claim 1, and are allowable, without more. As these claims are allowable as dependent claims, there is no requirement for a detailed traverse to be provided in order that the response to the Office action be complete.

However, the Examiner deemed that, although Gotoh does not explicitly teach the arrangements of Claims 2-7, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious the claimed limitations for various unsupported reasons (e.g. improving/modifying the amount of light through the anti-reflective structure, creation of different light patterns). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Examiner has not provided a legally sufficient reason for asserting that the references are combinable. As the court explained in *In re Fritsch* “[t]he mere fact that the reference could be modified as proposed by the Examiner is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.” See *In re Fritsch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23

USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1318 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (Court reversed obviousness rejection involving technologically simple concept because there was no finding as to the principle or specific understanding within the knowledge of a skilled artisan that would have motivated the skilled artisan to make the claimed invention). See also MPEP 2144.03.


Applicants have provided specific data regarding the claimed limitations and submit that the rejection constitutes improper use of hindsight and, as such, uses the Applicants own teachings to bootstrap the rejection. "Obviousness may not be established using hindsight or in view of the teachings or suggestions of the inventor." *Para-Ordnance Mfg. v. SGS Importers Int'l*, 73 F.3d 1085, 1087, 37 USPQ2d 1237, 1239 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(citing *W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1551, 1553, 220 USPQ 303, 311, 312-13(Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, none of the cited references anticipate the arrangements of Claims 2-7. Accordingly, Claims 2-7 are independently patentable over the cited references.

## **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 46,193  
Agent for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200